

**REMARKS**

Claims 71, 73 and 75-77 are pending. Claims 75 and 76 have each been amended without narrowing its scope.

In the Office Action, claims 71, 76 and 77 were allowed. Claims 73 and 75 were objected to as allegedly being duplicative of one another.


Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interviews with applicants' undersigned representative including the telephone interview of August 16, 2010. During the interview, the Applicants undersigned representative explained to the Examiner that claims 73 and 75 were not intended to be duplicates of one another. The Examiner suggested the above minor formal amendment to claim 75 to make even more clear that claim 75 is not duplicative of claim 73. Claim 76 was also amended, also without narrowing its scope, for consistency of terminology among the claims.

The Examiner stated during the interview that the above amendments would be entered, and that once the amendments were made, he would allow the case.

In view of the foregoing, the objection is believed to be obviated. Since no other rejections or objections are presently outstanding, the application is believed in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1633 Broadway  
New York, New York 10019-6708  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant